

Historical reconstruction of socio-economic system in Khorezm oasis on the archeology of the Neolithic period

Matkarimov Khamidbek Olimbayevich¹

¹Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

Email: khamidbek_m@umail.uz

ABSTRACT

As a result of the development of archeological researches in the Aral Sea region, the range of materials was gradually increased. In the early stages of research, the promotion and resolution of historical reconstruction issues based on archaeological sources were limited to unbiased reasons, and the introduction and description of the archaeological material and evidence obtained in the first place was necessary. Therefore, even in the 50s and 60s of the last century, most of their scientific publications were devoted to the "preliminary", "some" results of the study of monuments in the Khorezm oasis, as well as the description of excavations and findings in particular places. Such an approach is undoubtedly relevant in archeological science, due to its role in field research. Also, the archaeological materials of the Neolithic and Bronze Age, which were found in the oasis, provided wide opportunities for studying the socio-economic system of ancient communities.

Keywords: Khorezm oasis, Neolithic and Bronze Age, historical hydrography.

1. INTRODUCTION

From the methods of sociological researches in archeology to archeology in the 1970s, to define the function of ancient stone and bone tools, to characterize it as an essential component of the labor force, and to summarize archeological data[1,p.129]. It is well known that labor activity is carried out within the framework of social relations. In ancient times, production and social relations were an important prerequisite for labor. In the study of this topic, as well as the reconstruction of ancient forms of economic activity that existed at a time when there was no record, the use of various sources of information in the process of restoration is crucial[2,p.107].

According to V.M. Masson, ethnographic research provides a great deal of evidence for the study of the lifestyles, customs and culture of ancient society and is used in comparative analysis. Archaeological data, however, is a material basis that is directly related to past societies, that is, material evidence, and it contains various information about these societies[3,p.13]. V. M. Masson describes the process of historical reconstruction of the economic and social structure of ancient society as follows:

- Process of ethnocultural and social reconstruction
- References
- Ethnocultural
- Issues
- Reconstruction of ethnic ties
- Team Lifestyle
- Social topics
- Reconstruction of the economic structure
- Reconstruction of the social structure
- The ideological structure

In our opinion, when the content of this chart is slightly clarified, its structure is primarily related to the two most important components of ancient society - material production and socio-economic relations. Since the Stone Age, material production has been directly linked to the production and acquisition of natural foods. A.V. Vinogradov writes that materials that can be used to study Neolithic farms are divided into three interrelated sources. Specifically, the first group is composed of data on natural and geographical conditions, such as geographical area, climate, landscape and water supply (historical hydrography).

The second group, in particular, is archaeological material (labor tools, housing, local features of the population) and the third group includes sources that directly describe different areas of ancient farms (ancient fauna and flora found in archaeological excavations - animals, fish and birds. bones, fruits)[4,p.136]

The aforementioned data indicate that the sources of archeology, ethnography, paleogeography, paleofauna and paleobotany are very important in the process of restoring the lifestyle and social order of farms of the distant past. There is also an urgent need to study the geography of the settlements of different periods, the process of land development, the characteristics of the territorial location of the seed communities and the identification of economic and cultural types[5,p.124]

The following is an analysis of the results of the historical reconstruction of the Neolithic and Bronze Age in the history of archeological studies in the Aral Sea region of the Khorezm region and the development of knowledge in this regard.

The process of restoring the Neolithic economy, social and social systems of the Khorezm oasis began with the discovery of the Kaltaminor culture, the study and study of the tools, spaces and habitats, household goods, food, traditions and beliefs of the people of that period. and historical reconstruction issues were initially addressed by S.P. Tolstov's works[6,p.24]

The Kaltaminorans used their fishing and hunting gear and made their weapons from stone and bone. Many fish bones have been found in Jonbas 4, mostly carp, carp and legume. The bones of pigs, deer, and floating birds have been found in the Neolithic monuments, where hunting is also important[7,p.205].

S.P. Tolstov wrote: "The community dwellings of the people of the island of Andaman (the Bay of Bengal) are very similar to ethnographic and developmental levels and type of farming (grass fishermen and neolithic hunters, round ceramics, bullets and arcs)." Thus, the plan of the fortresses' dwellings (Jonbos 4, Kavat 7) was rebuilt as a large hut, with an oval or elongated flap. The restoration of the Kaltaminor culture habitat was influenced by the presence of flat cone-shaped huts in tribal communities that preserved the primitive way of life in South Asia, Oceania and Africa. In this case, the method of ethnographic comparison was used in the historical reconstruction[8,p.78].

The rebuilding of Jonbos 4's habitat with a canopy roof and a wooden pillar relying on wooden columns has raised doubts among some researchers that M.P. Gryaznov described his appearance as a cellar [9,p.132]. V.M. Masson supported this new reconstruction, writing: "It should be noted that this reconstruction is not only consistent with archaeological excavations, it is also more deserving of the cold climate of Khorezm than its light hut".

However, the large basement dwellings of the Neolithic period suggest that M. P. Gryaznov's conclusion has not been proven. On the contrary, in 1961, in the Bukhara oasis, the remains of a light hut on the ground consisting of wooden pillars and cables were found in the Neolithic period Darvozakir. Its area is 81 square meters (for comparison, the hut in the Jonbos 4 space is 290 m²)[10,p.29]. Researchers estimate that between 25 and 30 people were living in Darvazir. At the residence of Jonbos 4. According to S. P. Tolstov, a community of 100–120 people lived.

It is worth noting that archaeological resources play a major role in the study of socioeconomic relations and the composition of the seed community. S.P. Tolstov based on archaeological material obtained at Jonbos 4, described the social system of the Kaltaminor culture as a matriarchal system - that is, the grandmother was supposed to have lived with several families of close relatives.

According to S.P. Tolstov, in the center of Jonbas 4 hut there is a burning fire, about one meter wide, behind which a number of cooking ovens are located, and most of the household items are found around these centers. The small fireplace probably belonged to a couple families, but the large furnace was used during the community rituals and ceremonies.

Since the Neolithic times, individual huts belonging to the tribal communities have been found in the vast areas of the Lower Amudarya and the Kyzylkum Desert. Such homes have been found and investigated in the 7th Floor, Tolstov Space, Lavlakon 26 and Darvozakir. The dwellings of the huts are on average 81–120–160–360 sq. M. These figures suggest that the number of hut dwellers varies. Researchers estimate that the Neolithic period was composed of 5-6 or 4 family members. If the figure was 4-5 people on average, there would be 25 family members in the Jonbos 4 hut, approximately two in the family.

There are differing opinions on leading farms in the areas where Kaltaminor culture is spread. They say that in the steppe plains of Central Asia, in the Neolithic, dominant farming was dominated by millennium BC. At the end of the third millennium BC. On the contrary, the other view is related to the conclusion that the early stages of the Calaminorians were engaged in animal husbandry and farming at the end of the Neolith. The discovery of stone lamps and sickle steps in some of the monuments has led to the conclusion that farming in the Lower Zarafshan Valley dates back to the Neolithic period.

However, researchers who found the light and stone steps in the Tuzkon area, particularly in the Neolithic era in the Bukhara oasis, concluded: "The existence of weapons for milling and grinding does not always signify farming. It's likely that they used similar weapons to grind wild barley, wheat cereals, roots, dried fruits, etc."

This view can be agreed, as it is difficult to believe that the stone cutters and lamps associated with the harvesting and processing of foodstuffs are self-reliant. According to ethnography, such weapons were used by tribal and non-agricultural tribes for a long time.

Larger grain storage racks and special containers and cultured grain residues were not identified at the Kaltaminor sites. There is some evidence of archeology - the bones of animals, poultry and fish, and the fact that the Kaltaminor communities are engaged in farming, fishing, hunting and thermal engineering. According to animal bones, people hunted wild oxen, deer, poultry, gazelles, pigs, rabbits and other animals. Hunting was carried out with arrows and arrows, and fishing was carried out by hand and baskets, and sharp wooden and bone-shaped spear weapons.

In recent years, the issue of the domestication of wild animals has been raised in Kaltaminor culture. According to A.E. Berdimuradov, new archeological data show that the Neolithic communities inhabiting the Kyzylkum border were not only hunting and fishing, but were also cattle breeders. At the same time, there is evidence that the ancient culture of Kaltaminor was 3,000 years old BC. It was talked about ancientization until the VII millennium[11,p.5]

According to N.U. Holmatov, Findings of the VII-IV millennium in the BC Sazaghan, Jangal, and Ochancer areas (domestic animals - sheep, goats' bones, specialized weaponry, microlytes and lamps), along the northern slopes of the large slopes of the northern slopes of the Karatepa mountain range. the formation of livestock and farming[12,p.28]

It is also suggested that the Kaltaminor culture breeding communities in the Kyzylkum region knew the areas of production farms during the Neolithic period.

D.A. Maksudov's mesolithic Neolithic rock paintings contain images of bulls and goats hunting, with the use of sharp sticks and animal horns to capture the roots of the plants and the harvest of corn plants with sharp blades with sharp blades on wood and bone stalks. has passed. According to the researcher, this experience was used in early agriculture as a result of the prevalence of mountain thermists living in the foothills and later in the oasis[13,p.29]

In general, the development of such processes is unlikely, but the origin of farming in the oases near the Zarautsay monument in southern Uzbekistan (Muzrabad, Sherabad) is completely different. These include the Bronze Age migration of agricultural tribes to the development of new fertile lands.

In various natural and geographical conditions of Central Asia (steppes, foothills and mountains), the issue of transition to livestock and farming forms has become controversial. This issue was discussed as a result of the study of the monuments of the Ferghana Valley, the western slopes of the Zarafshan Mountains, and the mountain areas of south-western Tajikistan (Hisor culture). It is advisable to clarify the socio-economic need and the reasons for the transition to productive farms in the aforementioned regions, without excluding the possibility of different opinions. For example, in mountainous areas, hunting is more favorable than in grazing conditions (as evidenced by the numerous hunting weapons found in the areas). The development of rain-fed farming in the foothills was a natural occurrence of the Neolithic period for a small seed community. For this reason, the Zarafshan Mountains (up to the Eneolithic period) and the Kuchitang and Baysun Mountains have not found any artifacts (until the Bronze Age).

Kaltaminor culture monuments are common in a wide area - along the banks of the river Uzboy of the Amu Darya River in the northern Karakum, the Ustyurt Chinat, the Southern Aral Sea, Central and South Kyzylkum. These were seasonal habitats located in remote deserts and steppes, along river banks and lakes. According to the natural conditions of these areas (large reeds, wild fruit trees and

shrubs, various wild animals, abundance of fish in lakes and rivers) Hunting, fishing and thermodynamics play a significant role in the economic life of the Kalamantan. In such natural-geographical conditions, the question of the early formation of agriculture and livestock remains open. In fact, in the first agricultural regions of the East, the soil was fertile, the climate was warm, and there were cereals such as wild wheat and barley. For this reason, wheat and barley were first cultured.

S.P. Tolstov wrote about the transition of the Kaltaminor culture communities to livestock in the late stages of the Neolithic era, G.F. Korobkova came to that same point[13,p.78]. However, the Neolithic period in the South Aral Sea was not easy, since the location of the settlements was not far from the lake and river banks, and the surrounding area was surrounded by forests and shrubs. In the southern regions of Central Asia during the Neolithic period (Cattle culture) the livestock was grazed in grasslands around the houses, and the way of grazing cattle away from pastures was unknown. This form of economy is determined by the living standards of the population.

In our view, in terms of chronology and periodicity, it is not expedient to interpret the process of transition to producing farms as a common phenomenon relating to the history of different historical and cultural regions of Central Asia. At the same time, the degree of cultural development of tribes living in one or another natural and geographical environment should be taken into account. This is reflected in new research.

Hunting tools (stone spear and arrowheads, skin-related cuttings) play a major role in the weapons of Kaltaminor culture. Therefore, M.A. Itina has focused its attention on numerous fossils of wild animals not only in the South Aral Sea, but also in the Kyzylkum and Lower Zarafshan Neolithic sites. As mentioned above, stone-cut steps and lamps have been used by the Neolithic people in the steppe regions for the purpose of harvesting and harvesting wild grain and plants.

The following factors and archaeological features play an important role in the reconstruction of the socio-economic system of the Neolithic period:

- ⊕ natural environment, geographical conditions;
- ⊕ Features of spatial location of spaces;
- ⊕ labor, household items;
- ⊕ The size of housing;
- ⊕ Paleofauna and flora.

At that time man was dependent on available natural resources. The success of hunting, fishing and thermal training and the abundance of prey were seasonal. In the primitive society, in the low level of production, man could only live on the basis of merging, community, or family-collective family order. That is why the communities of recycling farms based on the socioeconomic characteristics united the common property and tools of labor, housing and living. Also, the requirements for the distribution of labor by age and sex of the offspring are observed. In addition, some individuals with skills, knowledge and experience in weapons production, hunting and fishing have a high social status in society. In general, this is the case in Central Asia's primitive society. Thus, social management has been established and is defined by the functions of organizing, coordinating, regulating and implementing the socio-economic life of each community.

2. CONCLUSION

By the Neolithic period, the region had already developed farming areas such as hunting, fishing and thermal engineering. Archeological materials obtained in the 1950s and 60s of the last century and later have been an important source for the study of the social, economic, and regional features of the Kaltaminor culture and their comparison with the cultures of the Neolithic period in Central Asia.

REFERENCES

1. Korobkova G.F. Application of the method of microanalysis to the study of the functions of stone and bone tools. Archeology and natural sciences // MIA.– M., 1965.
2. Semenov S.A. Experimental method of studying primitive technique. Archeology and natural sciences // MIA., - M., 1965.

3. Masson V.M. Jaitun settlement (the problem of the formation of a producing economy) // MIA. - L., 1971.
4. Masson V.M. Economics and social structure of ancient societies (in the light of archeology data). - L.: Science, 1976.
5. Vinogradov A.V. Ancient hunters and fishermen of the Central Asian Mesopotamia // Tr. HAEE. -M., 1981.
6. Geography and Cartography of Bronze and Early Iron Age Monuments / Editor A. S. Sagdullaev - Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2019.
7. Tolstov S. P. Ancient Khorezm. The experience of historical and archaeological research. - M.: Moscow State University, 1948.
8. Nikolsky G.V., Radakov D.V., Lebedev D. Remains of fish from the Neolithic site of Janbas-kala No. 4 // Tr. HAE. - M., 1952.
9. Tolstov S. In search of ancient Khorezm culture. M.: 1948
10. Gryaznov M. P. About the Kelteminar House // New in Soviet Archeology. - Moscow: Nauka, 1965.
11. Gulyamov Ya. G., Islamov U., Askarov A. Primitive culture and the emergence of irrigated agriculture in the lower reaches of Zarafshan. - Tashkent: Fan. 1966.
12. Berdimuradov A.E. Development of Uzbek archeology during the years of independence // Archeology of Uzbekistan in the years of independence: achievements and perspectives. - Samarkand, 2016.
13. Kholmatov N.U. The results of the study of archeological expedition of SamSU during the independence of our republic // Archeology of Uzbekistan in the years of independence: achievements and perspectives. - Samarkand, 2016.
14. Holmatov N.U. Sazagon culture and its role in the Neolithic Uzbekistan: History Science. Dr.Diss aftoreferati. - Samarkand, 2019.
15. Maksudov F.A. To the interpretation of the plots of Zarautsay's cave paintings // Archeology of Uzbekistan in the years of independence: achievement and prospects. - Samarkand, 2016.
16. Tolstov S.P. In the footsteps of ancient Khorezm civilization. M.: 1948.